FOR MYSORE STATE

Revenue (1950) Department.

MS SERIES

G.O. NO. 802

Dated 17-3-1950.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Grow More Food – Well subsidy schemes – Conference with Collectors of certain districts – Proposals made by Collectors – Board's remarks – Orders passed

BOARD OF REVENUE (FOOD PRODUCTION)

Abstract.

Grow More Food - Well subsidy Schemes - Conference with Collectors of certain districts - Proposals made by Collectors - Board's Remarks - Submitted.

Board's Ref.F.P.I A.346/49-1,
dated 30th August 1949.

From C.K.Vijayaraghavan,Esq., I.C.S.,
Commissioner of Food Production.

N.S.Nani,Esq., I.C.S.,
Secretary to the Commissioner of Food Production.

***

Read:- Extracts from the notes of discussions.

***

The Commissioner of Food Production has in the course of his tour during Julu 1949 discussed with the Collectors of Madura, Ramnad,Tirunelveli,Tiruchirapalli,Malabar,South Kanara,Coimbatore,Salem and the Nilgiris Districts a the working of the Well Subsidy Schemes. The suggestions made by the Collectors and the Commissioner of Food Production's recommendations with regard to them are given below:-

(i) The majority of the Collectors expressed the opinion that the condition requiring that the wells under the New Well Subsidy Schemes 1948-49 and 1949-50 should have a minimum depth of 24 feet should be relaxed. The point was already raised last year in Board's Reference No.V sel.6894/48-1 dated 28-1-1949, but the Government did not accept the recommendation. The Board has re-examined the question in the light of the views expressed by the Collectors at the Conference. There are several areas where the water table is as near as 6 feed from ground level and it is impossible in such areas to carry the excavation down to 24 feed. In para 17 of G.O.No.1126 Revenue dated 28-4-1949 the Government have recognised that the dimensions of the well to be prescribed must necessarily vary according to the water table in each locality. It is of the opinion that it is unnecessary to insist on a minimum depth alone especially when a minimum dept' of water in the well even in the height of summer is fixed. In the circumstances, the Board recommends that the Government may be pleased to waive the condition in regard to the depth of the well in the light of the views expressed by the Collectors based on the experience gained by the working of the Schemes.

(The Board is separately submitting its recommendations regarding the extension to the other districts of the concession allowed to Coimbatore District reducing to 4 feed the minimum water level in the height of summer instead of six feed. It would be sufficient if the minimum water level is insisted on and the Collectors allowed discretion to fix the depth of wells. If this is done it will be possible to have more wells constructed with the same allotment.

(ii) <u>Relaxation of the rule that two-thirds of the allot- should be set apart for wells in wet areas and one-third alone for wells indry areas.</u>

The Board is issuing orders in the matter with reference to the conditions in each district as authorised in para 4 of G.O.No.1126 Revenue dated 28-4-1949.

(iii) Extensions of time granted for the completion of wells piecemeal.

It was pointed out that piecemeal extensions of time not only threw more work on the district establishment in rechecking cases which had been once inspectdd but was creating a feeling in the minds of ryots that extensions of time would be automatically granted and thus prevented them from executing the works quickly. The Collectors suggested that a basic period for the completion of the wells should be fixed and that Collectors should be permitted to extend it in individual cases.

Under the present system a ryot who gets his loan, say, in April 1949 has time till September 1950 to complete the well i.e., eighteen months whereas another ryot who is given a loan in March 1950 will have only six months to complete the work The Commissioner of Food Production considers that it will be far more fair to prescribe a basic period within which the wells should be completed. It accordingly recommends that a period of one year from the date of disbursement of the subsidy loan may be fixed as the time for the completion of the work and that the Collectors may be empowered to grant extension of time at their discretion upto a limit of 6 months in deserving cases. The grantees will then have a total period of 1½ years which will be quite sufficient to construct a well.

(iv) Clarification of paragraph 6 of G.O.No.1126, Revenue,dated 28-4-1949. The first sentence of paragraph 6 of the G.O. Has been interpreted by some of the subordinate officers to mean that if an applicant who has obtained a subsidy of Rs.500/- or 750/- constructs a well costing more than Rs.2,000/- meeting the balance of cost from his own resources, the work will not qualify for a subsidy and the subsidy advanced is therefore recoverable. The Board considers that such an interpretation is not in accordance with the spirit of the scheme and that a grantee who has incurred a larger expenditure should not be penalised for his having spent more from his own resources. The Board recommends that the wording of para 6 of the G.O. may be suitably amended so as to make the intention clear.

2. xx xx xx

3. xx xx xx

4 xx xx xx

Sd. xx xx
For Secretary.

To
The Secretary to Government,Revenue Department.
para 1 only.
To the Collectors of Madura,Ramnad,Tirunelveli,and Trichirapalli.
para 2 only.
To the Collectors of South Kanara and Malabar (para 3 only)
to the Collectors of Coimbatore and Salem (Para 4 only)

/True extract/

Superintendent.

Revenue Department.

G.O.Ms.No.802. Dated 17.3.50.
Read the following:-

From the Board of Revenue, F.P.I.-A/346/49-1,
dated 30th August 1949.

**

ORDER:-

The Government have examined the suggestions made by certain collectors on the working of the Well Subsidy Scheme and the recommendations of the Board of Revenue thereon and pass the following orders:-

(1) Relaxation of the condition relating to the minimum depth of subsidy wells:

The attention of the Board of Revenue is invited to the orders already passed in para 2 of G.O.No.2199, Revenue, dated 24-8-1949.

(2) Reduction of water-level in wells in districts other than Coimbatore from 6 feet to 4 feet:

Separate orders have been issued on this suggestion in G.O.No.584 Ms. Revenue dated 3-3-50.

(3) Extension of time granted for completion of wells:

The Government accept the recommendation of the Board of Revenue and direct that a period of one year from the date of disbursement of the subsidy loan should be fixed as the time for completion of well works and that Collectors should be empowered to grant extension of time at their discretion upto a limit of 6 months in deserving cases. These orders will apply only to the New Well subsidy Scheme, 1950-51 and will not apply to earlier schemes.

(4) Clarification of para 6 of G.O.Ms.No.1126, Revenue, dated 28-4-1949.

The Government accept the recommendation of the Board of Revenue and accordingly direct that the first sentence in para 6 of G.O.No.1126, Revenue, dated 28-4-1949 and "also" occurring in the second sentence thereof should be deleted.

(By Order of His Excellency the Governor)

K.M.Unnithan.
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue (Food Production)
Copy to all Collectors, except the Collector of Madras.
Copy to the Director of Industires and Commerce.
Copy to D.A.
Copy to Food and Agriculture Department.
Copy to the Development Department.
Copy to the Secretary H.R.E. Board.
Copy to the Rayalaseema Development Board.

/True copy/

Superintendent.

nr.19/6

Well Subsidy Schemes - Extensions of time granted for completion of wells piecemeal.

Remarks of the Board of Revenue.

It was pointed out that piecemeal extensions of time not only threw more work on the district establishment in rechecking cases which had been once inspected but was creating a feeling in the minds of ryots that extensions of time would be automatically granted and thus prevented them from executing the works quickly. The Collectors suggested that a basic period for the completion of the wells should be fixed and that Collectors should be permitted to extend it in individual cases.

Under the present system a ryot who gets his laon say, in April 1949 has time till September 1950 to complete the well i.e., eighteen months whereas another ryot who is given a loan in March 1950 will have only six months to complete the work. The Commissioner of Food Production considers that it will be far more fair to prescribe a basic p riod within which the wells should be completed. It accordingly recommends that a period of one year from the date of disbursement of the subsidy loan may be fixed as the time for the completion of the work and that the Collectors may be empowered to grant extension of time at their discretion upto a limit of 6 months in deserving cases. The grantees will then have a total period of 1½ years which will be quite sufficient to construct a well.

Revenue Department.

The last dates prescribed for the payment of subsidies and the completion of wells under the several well subsidy schemes are shown below:-

	Last date for payment of subsidies.	Last date for completion of wells.
1.Accelerated Well Subsidy Scheme.	15.6.46	30.6.49
2.Ceded Districts Modified Well Subsidy Scheme.	1-3-47	30.6.49
3.New Well Subsidy Scheme	31.3.48	30.6.49

	Last date for payment of subsidies.	Last date for completion of wells.
4.New Well Subsidy Scheme 48-49	31.3.49	30.9.49
5.New Well Subsidy Scheme49-50	31.3.49	30.9.50

Under the Accelerated and Ceded Districts modified well subsidy Schemes the grantees have had nearly three years within which to complete the wells. Under the New Well Subsidy Scheme 47-48 the grantees who obtained subsidies even on the last day prescribed for the payment of subsidies i.e. on 31-3-48 have been allowed a year and 3 months to complete the wells. Proposals for further extending the time in respect of this scheme are under consideration separately. Under the N.W.S.S. 48-49 the grantees have been allowed only 6 months from the last date prescribed for payment of subsidy loans. Proposals for extending the time allowed under scheme for completion of wells are sparately under consideration. It has been ordered in circulation that time may be extended till 30-6-50 and orders will issue shortly. After orders are issued the grantees under this scheme also will have more than a year's time to complete the wells. The time now allowed for completion of wells under the N.W.S.S. 49-50 is 30-9-50. It is likely that the time under this scheme may also have to be extended. The grantees under all the schemes therefore either had or likely to have ample time within which to complete the wells. No action therefore appears called for on the Board's suggestion. For Orders. Finance may see.

It has been decided that the last yaar for the New Wells Scheme should be 1950-51. It therefore seems that the issue of some such general orders regarding extension as suggested by the Board at 'c' on p.2 n.f. may be

desirable. It may also be made clear that the Govt. will not be inclined to give further time for the completion of wells.

Board's view appears to be the most reasonable one. Time granted for the well should be calculated from the date of disbursement of the subsidy. This will also spread out the work of the inspecting staff more evenly, because a few cases will mature every day instead of all the cases maturing on one particular day. We may say therefore that, as regards the subsidies granted under the 1949-50 scheme, one year's time from the date of disbursement of the subsidy will be granted. Collectors may also be empowered to extend the time by not more than six months, in hard cases. These instructions will, however, not apply to the previous schemes.

Fin.(P Lr R)

Fin. may agree to the proposal at A on p.4 (a) above.

Rev. department.

The proposal at A at page 4(a) is for approval.

The Board's proposal is no doubt reasonable. It can, however, be applied only to persons to whom subsidy loans are granted hereafter. It cannot be applied retrospectively. That is to say, a person who was granted a loan in May or June,1949 under the 1949-50 scheme cannot now be told that the should complete the well within a period of one year from the date of grant of the loan when, at the time the loan was sanctioned, the last date for completion of wells under the scheme had been fixed as the 30th of September,1950.

2.However, this point is probably only of academic interest because, on the basis of a communication from the Govt. of India that the wells scheme will not hereafter be eligible for cash subsidy, the Finance Dept. have advised the issue of orders stopping immediately the payment of subsidy loans under the scheme.

To A.S

With reference to D.S's. note at 'A' above it is submitted that orders revising the N.W.S S.49-50 have since been issued; please see (R) . It is for orders whether the Board's proposal at 'C' on page 2.c.f. may be applied only to persons to whom subsidy loans are paid hereafter under the N.W.S.S. 49-50. As Govt. have recently decided to continue the wells scheme during 50-51 orders are also solicited whether the Board's proposal may be made to apply to all the grants under the N.W.S.S.1950-51 also.

Finance may see again.

Finance Department

The Board's proposal at 'X' on p.4 ante may be approved.

Fin.(PWR) Dept.

(Previous Finance note on p.4 (b) above).

Finance may agree with D.S. Revenue Department that the Boards' proposal at 'X' on p.4 above may be accepted.

H.M.(Fin.) should see.

Clarification of para 6 of G.O.Ms.Rev.1126 dated 28-4-49.

Remarks of the Board of Revenue.

The first sentence of paragraph 6 of the G.O. has been interpreted by some of the subordinate officers

to mean that if an applicant who has obtained a subsidy of Rs.500/- or Rs.750/- constructs a well costing more than Rs.2000/- meeting the balance of cost from hos own resources, the work will not qualify for a subsidy and the subsidy advanced is therefore recoverable. The Board considers that such an interpretation is not in accordance with the spirit of the scheme and that a grantee who has incurred a larger expenditure should not be penalised for his having spent more from hos own resources. The Board recommends that the wording of para 6 of the G.O. may be suitably amended so as to make the intention clear.

Revenue Department.

Please see the first sentence in para 6 of G.O.1126 Ms.Rev. dated 28-4-49. This sentence was introduced for the first time under the N.W.S.S.47-48 - please see para 6 of G.O.Ms.518 Rev. dated 1-3-47. This provision was based on Board's recommendation at 'C' on page 46 c.f. of G.O.518.Ms. Rev. dated 1-3-47. The Board now considers that subsidies should be paid even in the case of wells the cost of which exceeds Rs.2000/- and that no recoveries should be made in those cases if subsidies had already been paid. The Board recommends that para 6 of the G.O. should be modified accordingly. Attention is invited to the last sentence in para 11 of G.O.1126 Ms.Rev. dated 28-4-49., according to which the intention of Government is that no distinction is to be made between the well-to-do and poor ryots. The non-payment of subsidies in the case of wells costing more than Rs.2000/ would mean discrimination against richer ryots. It is for orders whether the Board's recommendation may be accepted and para 6 of G.O modified by deleting the opening sentence and substituting the following sentence:-

'Subsidies under the scheme will be advanced for the sinking of wells irrespective of the cost of construct

Finance may see for remarks.

The Government may agree that subsidies need not be refused simply because the cost of the wells exceeded the normal amount i.e. double the amount of the subsidy - please see para 4 at p.1 of G.O.(1). But the amendment suggested at 'A' on p.5 supra is not suitable. It may perhaps read

"Subsidies to the extent specified in paragraph 4 of this G.O. will be granted but it will be subject to the maxima specified below."

It would be sufficient to omit the first sentence of para 6 and delete the words "also" in the second sentence.

Fin.(P.W.R.)

Finance may agree that para 6 of G.O.1126 Rev. dated 28-4-1949 may be amended as suggested at B above

Rev.Department.

The suggestion at B above is for approval.

If we are going to stop the payment of subsidy loans, it is unnecessary to amend the G.O. The Board's view may be accepted and it may be requested to issue appropriate instructions in the matter to the subordinate staff.

Mr.

Compared by:
29/6
M K Krishnamurthi 29/6

/True extract/

nr.21/6

Superintendent.